

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 \* \* \*

6 James Paul Otterson,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 Uber Eats, Inc., et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00054-JAD-DJA

11 **Order**

12 Before the Court are Plaintiff James Paul Otterson's motion to respond (ECF No. 17),  
13 motion to identify attorneys (ECF No. 18), and motion to identify counsel (ECF No. 19). Other  
14 than their titles, these three motions are identical. The requested relief, however, does not match  
15 up with the titles. In each motion, Plaintiff asks the Court to "move the trial, as well as the trial-  
16 related deadlines and non-trial related deadlines" to June 1, 2022. The Court interprets Plaintiff  
17 as referring to those deadlines which would typically be set by a discovery plan and scheduling  
18 order under Local Rule 26-1. However, there is no discovery plan and scheduling order in this  
19 case. No defendants or other parties have appeared in this case. And Plaintiff does not assert to  
20 have initiated the scheduling of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) conference which  
21 would trigger case-related deadlines under Local Rule 26-1.

22  
23 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motions (ECF Nos. 17, 18, and 19) are  
24 **denied without prejudice.**

25  
26 DATED: May 10, 2022

27   
28 **DANIEL J. ALBREGTS**  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**